

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

Tom Arbino,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 1:12cv318

U.S. Marshal Service, *et al.*,

Judge Michael R. Barrett

Defendants.

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation filed by the Magistrate Judge on September 11, 2012 (Doc. 47).

Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the Report and Recommendation in a timely manner. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court notes, however, that though such notice was served upon Petitioner, it was returned to the Court due to Petitioner's failure to apprise the Court of his change of address. By failing to keep the Court apprised of his current address, the Plaintiff demonstrates a lack of prosecution of his action. See, e.g., *Theede v. United States Department of Labor*, 172 F.3d 1262, 1265 (10th Cir. 1999)(Failure to object to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation due to delay resulting from party's failure to bring to the court's attention a change in address constitutes failure to object in a timely manner. Because the Recommendation was mailed to the last known address, it was properly served, and party waived right to appellate review). See also *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991)(A *pro se* litigant has an affirmative duty to diligently pursue the prosecution of his cause of action); *Barber v. Runyon*, No. 93-6318, 1994 WL 163765, at \*1 (6th Cir. May 2, 1994) (A *pro se* litigant has a duty to supply the court with notice of any and all changes in his address). Therefore, no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 47) have been filed.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** consistent with the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 47) of the Magistrate Judge that it is hereby **ADOPTED** in its entirety. Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal (Doc. 26) is **DENIED**; Plaintiff's Motions (Docs. 27-34, 36-45) are all **DENIED**; and Plaintiff's motions to halt collection and to change venue (Docs. 35 and 46) are **DENIED**. It is also **ORDERED**, consistent with the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 47) by the Magistrate Judge, that any further motions or pleadings from either party in this particular civil case are prohibited. Any further pleadings or motions tendered by the Plaintiff for filing in this within action are to be returned to the plaintiff by the Clerk of Court with the following notice: "No further documents can be filed in this closed case, per order of the district court."

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Michael R. Barrett  
Michael R. Barrett  
United States District Judge